



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

DETAILED NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAME/INITIALS
07/418,055 10/06/89 DE LUCA
PAPER NUMBER
MT CM00268U

MOTOROLA, INC., PATENT DEPT.
1500 NW 22 AVE.
BOYNTON BEACH, FL 33426-8753

WEISSMAN, P
RECEIVED
EXAMINER'S ACTION

264

3

DATE MAILED

06/08/90

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three (3) month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1-25 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 264

ART REJECTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

5 Office action:

10 A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15 Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

20 ^{and 23}
2. Claims 1-12, 14, 22¹ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Matai et al.

25 Claims 1, 22;

30 Matai et al. shows a paging receiver in which control means stores received messages to either a common paging memory (source file) or an individual memory (source file) as dependent upon the received address (column 3, lines 60-66; column 8, lines 18-37; column 10, lines 41-45; column 11, lines 36-40). The common and individual messages can be selectively displayed by the user.

Art Unit 264

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate source files message storage in a pager receiver since Matai et al. shows the means for and purpose of storing received messages into categorized memory locations.

5

Claims 2-4;

The common and individual source files of Matai et al. are capable of storing a plurality of messages. The system necessarily stores messages in unoccupied slot or an occupied slot, dependent upon availability of memory as determined by the number of received messages (column 9, lines 23-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the various memory means of the claimed invention in the system of by Matai et al. since the referenced invention shows equivalent and alternative memory means.

Claims 5-6;

20 Matai et al. shows that the received address determines whether the message is stored in a common or individual memory location.

Claims 7-10;

The common and individual source files of Matai et al. are capable of storing a plurality of messages. The system necessarily stores messages in unoccupied slot or an occupied 5 slot, dependent upon availability of memory as determined by the number of received messages. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the various memory means of the claimed invention in the system of by Matai et al. since the referenced 10 invention shows equivalent and alternative memory means.

Claim 11;

Matai et al. shows all of the features claimed, as applied 15 to the rejection of claim 1 above, wherein the address of Matai et al. performs the operation of the claimed information source signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to 20 incorporate source files message storage and control means in a pager receiver since Matai et al. shows the means for and purpose of storing received messages into categorized memory locations.

Claims 12, 14, and 23;

The individual and common memory location means of Matai et al. are determined by the capacity of the components involved.

5 The number of messages stored in each of the memory means of Matai et al. is dependent upon message length. Furthermore, the individual and common memory means of Matai et al. can be ^{chosen to be} any suited and common memory means for a greater (or smaller) capacity of memory, as dependent upon the needs of the user since the advantages of a larger memory is widely recognized in the art 10 of pagers.

3. Claims 13, 15-21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Matai et al. as applied to claims 1-12 above, and further in view of Smoot et al.

15

Claim 13;

Matai et al. shows all of the subject matter claimed, except for the feature of establishing a basis of priority.

20 Smoot et al. shows a multiaddress pager with a call storage and priority paging option in which a received message is either stored as an emergency call or a non-emergency call.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the priority means of Smoot et al. in the pager of

Art Unit 264

Matai et al. since both systems provide means for storing messages in different source files.

Claims 15-17;

5 The examiner would like to take note of the fact that the cooperative relationship between the selecting and the ultimate function to be performed (i.e.- store messages in different memory locations) is not critical to the referenced inventions. Thus, the referenced inventions can utilize any common and suited method of selecting messages, such as claimed, since the means for and purpose of selecting messages based on a priority system is shown.

10

Claims 18-21, 24, and 25;

15 The subject matter claimed are features well known to the art of paging receivers. It is noted that these features are not critical to the referenced inventions, which may utilize any suited and common features, such as indicating unread messages. Thus, these features are merely a matter of choice and design since they do not present any unexpected modifications of the referenced inventions.

20

Art Unit 264

OTHER PRIOR ART CITED

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5 De Graaf shows a paging receiver in which control information is stored in one memory and message information is stored in another memory.

CONTACT INFORMATION

10

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Weissman whose telephone number is (703) 557-3304.

15 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 557-3321.

Peter Weissman; psw

703-557-3304

May 31, 1990

Donald J. Yusk
DONALD J. YUSKO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 264